DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 349 CS 206 014

AUTHOR Shafer, Robert E.
TITLE Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum: A British Proposal for Improving Literacy.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Language; Curriculum Development; *English Curriculum; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Language Acquisition; Language Processing; Language Styles; Secondary Education; Teacher Role; *Writing Processes; *Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS *England; *Writing across the Curriculum

ABSTRACT

The key ideas developed by the Writing across the Curriculum Project begun at the University of London in 1965 center on the ways in which discourse is acquired by children in a psycholinguistic sense. Among those ideas are (1) knowledge is socially determined through the interweaving of individual consciousnesses, each of which is busy construing its reality through and in contact with others; (2) a child's language and cognitive functions develop in parallel; (3) development in expressive language must come before development in participant and spectator language; (4) an individual's language use develops from the undifferentiated expressive mode along a continuum toward either participant or spectator language and through several stages of development within each; (5) the viewpoint of the writer is the significant controlling function in the relationship between the reader and the writer; and (6) there is a differentiation between the different roles of the teacher, both toward the individual student and toward the whole class. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197349

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

WRITING AND READING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM:

A British Proposal for Improving Literacy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert E. Shafer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Robert E. Shafer
Professor of English
Director of English Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum

CS206014

From an article in the journal, Scrutiny written by the British psychologist, D. W. Harding, in 1937, "The Role of the On Looker," James Britton became interested in the relationship between gossip, literature and the role of the spectator. Harding wrote:

> that in seeing a street accident, spectators are thrilled or horrified, pitying or perhaps ironic; they may judge one or other of the participants to have been at fault, they may reflect on the stupidities of modern transport. In all this they remain "detached," but though they make no direct operative response they still assess the event in the light of all the interests, desires, sentiments, and ideals that they can relate it to; and they feel it to be noteworthy, common-place, agreeable or disagreeable, tragic, funny, contemptable, heroic -- to mention a few of the cruder responses.[1]

In his chapter "Participant and Spectator" in the book, Language and Learning, Britton traces the idea of participant and spectator roles in language:

> In participation, we evaluate, necessarily, in preparation for action; but detached evaluative responses (that is, those of the spectator) the less intense, tend to be more widely comprehensive than the evaluation which preceded participation. One views the event in a more distant perspective and relates it to a more extensive system of information, beliefs and values. The spectator then...freed from the necessity to act, to meet the social demands made upon a participant, uses his freedom to evaluate more broadly, more amply: and Harding words his statement carefully to indicate that the process of evaluation assessment according to the "way I feel about things" plays a considerable part ("the spectators are thrilled or horrified, pitying..."). Moreover, evaluating -- relating the event to his system of values -- cannot in operation be kept distinct from the process of relating it to what he knows (his system of information), and to what from experience he has come to take on trust (his system of beliefs).[2]

Drawing upon the work of Langer, Buber and Burt, Britton builds up a view of various uses of language which lie within the spectator and participant roles:

[1] Harding, D. W. Scrutiny, 1937, p. 250

[2] Britton, James, Language and Learning, London, Penguin Books, 1970 pp. 109-11.

> Informing people, instructing people, persuading people, arguing, explaining, planning, setting forth the pros and cons, and coming to a conclusion -- these are participant uses of language, uses of language to get things done. Make believe play, day dreaming allowed, chatting about our experiences, gossip, travelers tales, and other story telling, fiction, the novel, drama, poetry -- these are uses of language in the spectator role.[3]

Britton proposes that we are in a constant state of fusing new experiences with old, but that we fuse, re-interpret and modify experience according to our own view of the world. Evaluation is central to the process in that we not only interpret new experiences in the light of old, that is, we interpret experience from our participant roles in life in light of past experiences, but we interpret other people's experiences through make-believe or fiction in terms of our past experience:

> When we use language in the participant role, we select and order our material according to the demands made by something outside ourselves, something that exists in the situation: information may be true or false and independent observation of all the circumstances could be used to determine which it is: instructions may be precise or vague, clear or confused and their usefulness to people carrying them out provides the basis for determining which they are: argument may be proved illogical, persuasion may be proved ineffectual. But in language in the role of spectator we operate on a different principle. We select and arrange our material first to please ourselves and secondly, not to please other people but to enable others to share our pleasure -- which is not the same thing. (Imagine that as I walk on the seashore I pick up a pocket full of shells and come home and arrange them. I could select and arrange them according to two different principles. The unlikelier one shows me to be a biologist: I have picked up shells I needed to complete my showcase, and when I get home I arrange them as a part of an exemplification of related species of marine life. If you were a better biologist than I was, you might come up behind me and say, "You've got that wrong -- you should put this one in that place." The more likely situation -- in which I am myself again -- is one in which I come home and arrange the shells on my mantlepiece. My principle of arrangement is to make a display, a pattern that pleases me. You could not then come up and say, "you've got

[3] Ibid. p. 122.

> that wrong," because there is no right and wrong beyond the pleasure or displeasure I feel. My criterion is one of "appropriateness" -- the appropriateness of each item to the other items and to the whole of the design as it appears to me. Thus, though we have assigned a function, use to the language of spectatorship, it is a use which is clearly distinguishable from that of a participant. "Language to get things done" remains intact as a criterion for the one role, and the language of being and becoming may roughly describe the other.[4]

According to Douglas Barnes, the "language across the curriculum" idea originated with him when he read an unpublished paper by Harold Rosen, of the University of London, Institute of Education in 1965. The parts of Rosen's paper which intrigued him came from a section called, "The Problems of Impersonal Language," as follows:

> But the verbalization of concepts within different subjects has a complex history; it is probably not a simple matter of perfectly evolved language which embodies one kind of rational thought. The models we look at are social institutions, and the differences between say the language of geology and the language of history may be in part due to the different history of these two subjects. In all events, we should set about distinguishing between the linguistic-conventional and the linguistic-intellectual, so that we can understand that traditional formulations are not sacrosanct...Much of the language encountered in school looks at pupils across a chasm. Some fluent children...adopt the jargon and parrot whole stretches of lingo. Personal intellectual struggle is made irrelevant and the personal view never asked for. Language and experience are torn asunder. Worse still, many children find impersonal language mere noise. It is alien in its posture, conventions, and strategies...these are extremes, and many children have areas of confidence and understanding, but frequently have to resort to desperate mimicry to see them through.[5]

Douglas Barnes became interested in a "study of the linguistic expectations set up in first year lessons in secondary schools." In October, 1966 he undertook an analysis of tape recorded lessons from a

[4] Ibid., pp. 124 and 125.

[5] Rosen, Harold, The Problems of Impersonal Language, University of London, Institute of Education, 1965, p. 12.

variety of subject fields with his graduate students at the University of Leeds. This led him to an interest in interaction between students and teachers. The analyses of these lessons led him and his students to a heightened sense of appreciation of the uses of language of teachers in the various subject disciplines and provided a basis for arguing that, A) some subject teachers fail to perceive the pedagogical implications of their uses of language, and B) that a descriptive study of teachers' and students' language use in various subject fields provides a potential method of helping teachers to become more aware of language functions. He urged that teachers develop some insights into the register of language which he called the register of language in secondary education. The gulf between the teacher's language and the pupils' language and the role of language and learning in learning new concepts was explained in his study. He also urged study of open and closed questions in helping students to "think aloud" at length.[6]

In 1968, the London Association of Teachers of English issued a document called "A Language Policy Across the Curriculum" which called for teachers in teachers' centers to "pool their observations of language in use in school" and to examine in detail specific problems, e.g. teachers' and pupils' questions, and the language of textbooks. It also called for teachers with different "specialisms" to compare their problems and for the various subject matter associations to devote conference time to meetings on language problems. It called further for

[6]Barnes, Douglas, "Language in the Secondary Classroom," in Language, the Learner and the School (revised edition) Penguin Books, London, 1971.

research on the nature of language and how it works and how it is acquired. It proposed that small scale investigations be made by teachers to furnish documents audiotaped and videotaped for their discussion and it called for schools to put into operation a language policy which would act as a guide for all their teachers.[7]

In 1965, the Writing Across the Curriculum Project at the University of London, Institute of Education was formally begun with the funding by the School's Council of a research project initiated by James Britton, Nancy Martin and Harold Rosen. Although the theory and research underlying the project is now well known in Britian it is still little known and understood in North America. Since the inception of the project, members of the project team have published a steady stream of books and articles in educational and other publications and contributions to various curriculum conferences which deal with research in reading and writing. In 1967 James Britton edited Talking and Writing, which contained, besides his introduction, an article by him entitled, "The Speaker" which discusses the participant and spectator roles in language, one also by Nancy Martin on "Stages of Progress in Language," and another by Harold Rosen on "The Language of Textbooks," containing his now well known (in England) observation that this language "looks at children across a chasm." The book, Language, the Learner and the School, mentioned previously was first published in 1969 and contains the first coining of the term "language across the

[7]Rosen, Harold, "Towards a Language Policy Across the Curriculum," in Barnes, Douglas, Britton, James and Rosen, Harold, Language, the Learner and the School, London Penguin Books, 1969, pp. 167 & 168.

curriculum." James Britton's book, Language and Learning followed in 1970 and was adopted as an Open University course text in the course, "Language and Learning" which insured that many teachers taking that in-service course from the Open University would become acquainted with the ideas of the project. Britton's article "What's the Use? A Schematic Account of Language Functions," first published in the Educational Review in 1971 was included in the reader for this course. There followed in 1973, Harold and Connie Rosen's book, the Language of Primary Children, and Understanding Writing by Tony Burgess (an officer of the developmental project team) and others, and Understanding Children Talking by Nancy Martin which appeared in 1975. The Development of Writing Abilities was published by the School's Council and also by McMillan Education in 1975. In 1976 the book, Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum 11-16 by Nancy Martin, Pat D'Arcy, Bryan Newton and Robert Parker appeared. And in 1977 a review of the work of the Project, Learning to Write or Writing to Learn? by Jeanette T. Williams, appeared, published by the National Foundation for Educational Research.

In the early 1970's both the conceptual framework for the Project and the proposals for school practice began to spread. When the government's "Committee of Enquiry into Reading and the Use of English" was set up in 1972, under Sir Allen Bullock of Oxford, James Britton was a committee member. When its report Language for Life was published in 1975 his influence could be detected chiefly throughout the work. Chapter 4 was called "Language and Learning" and Chapter 12 was titled "Language Across the Curriculum." Chapter 12 has become one of the chief instruments for shaping school policy as a result of the publica-

tion of the Bullock Report. School inspectors and other official bodies have initiated policies in schools in their areas that schools should draw up and implement "language across the curriculum" policy documents. Conferences have been called, courses instituted, briefing meetings held, and other publications such as Michael Marland's book, Language Across the Curriculum, have been published.

Developing the Model

It is the purpose of this paper to outline some of the key ideas in the development of this project. These ideas were developed beginning in 1965 and continuing until the present time by the Project Team in the Institute of Education, University of London.

The team, early on, chose to concentrate on "discourse" or "language as human behavior." They set themselves to the task of evolving a "theory of discourse." They limited their conception of discourse to a concern for the ways in which discourse was acquired by children in a psycholinguistic sense. They were concerned with the connections between language and thought and precisely with the acquisition of the human being's ability to symbolize or represent -- "the interface between the mind and reality." Man acts in the world of reality by means of, or in the light of, his representation, cumulatively built, of the world, as he has experienced it.[8] The team drew upon the work of Ernest Cassirer and Susanne Langer in documenting the human need to symbolize. From the point of view of Langer's "new key" in her book, Philosophy In a New Key, symbolizing is an essential human

[8]Britton, James; Burgess, Tony; Martin, Nancy; McLeod, Alex, and Rosen Harold, The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18), London, MacMillan Company, 1975 p. 22.

activity. The processes of human symbolic activity became essential to understanding the work of the project team. They were attracted by the statement, "Man interposes a network of worlds between the world and himself, and thereby becomes the master of the world," from the work of the phenomenologist Georges Gusdorf.[9] The team was also attracted by the views of the sociologists Berger and Luckmann:

> The most important vehicle of reality-maintenance is conversation. One may view the individual's everyday life in terms of the working away of a conversational apparatus that ongoingly maintains, modifies, and reconstructs his subjective reality.[10]

Further, the team began to view knowledge as personal in Polyony's sense. And more than that, they viewed it as essentially subjective -- the knower cannot be separated from the known, paraphrasing the title of one of John Dewey's books. The project team thus developed the view that knowledge is socially determined but through the "interweaving of individual consciousnesses, each of which is busy construing its reality through and in contact with others."[11] This hypothesis about knowledge implies the theory of learning in which language is central. If language is the primary means by which the person represents reality himself, then it is the primary means by which he learns. For this act of representation <u>is</u> the acquisition of knowledge. The

[9]Gusdorf, Georges, <u>Speaking</u> (translated by P. Brokelman), Chicago, Northwestern University Press, 1965 pp. 56-57.

[10]Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T., <u>The Social Construction of Reality</u>. London, Penguin Books, 1966 p. 172.

[11]Martin, Nancy; D'Arcy, Pat; Newton, Bryan, and Parker, Robert, <u>Writing and Learning</u>, p. 165.

learner is seen as constantly constructing representations in order to act in the world. And this act of constructing representations is learning behavior. Here the team drew on the work of the psychologist George Kelly, who proposes that learning behavior is a constant hypothesizing system where the learner makes predictions and generates hypothesis testing them against reality. Kelly's "personal construct system" tends to polarize reality into extremes such as good/bad and general/particular. Kelly's "personal construct" theory fit well with participant/spectator language roles. The Project Team worked it into their overall theory of discourse:

> If man constructs a representation of the world in order to operate in it, an alternative kind of behavior is then open to him: he may manipulate the representation without seeking outcomes in the actual world.[12]

Essentially this means that the individual learner is left free to attend to the representation itself -- to the form of language used, its patterns and images.

But how does the child develop from spectator type uses of language to participant uses of language? The Project Team proposed that as the child develops cognitively, along lines perhaps analogous to those suggested by Piaget, Bruner and Vygotsky, his or her language functions also develop in parallel. So he/she progresses from the inner speech "for one's self" as described by Vygotsky by internalizing more and more complex modes of use. He/she represents experience to herself/himself through progressively differentiated kinds of language functions which

[12] The Development of Writing Abilities, p. 80.

keep step with the dynamics of his/her mental life. But what are the stages through which he or she passes? Participant and spectator roles seem to stand at the opposite end of a continuum of language development. What the team needed was to conceive the mid-points of that continuum. How does a child develop language functions within the participant stage and within the spectator stage? The team looked carefully at Sapir's development of the concept of expressive language to assist them at this point:

> It is because it is learned early and piecemeal, in constant association with the color and requirements of actual contexts, that language, in spite of its quasi-mathematical form, is rarely a purely referential organization. It tends to be so only in scientific discourse, and even there it may be doubted whether the ideal of pure reference is ever attained by language. Ordinary speech is directly expressive, and the purely formal pattern of sounds, words, grammatical forms, phrases and sentences are always to be thought of as compounded by intended or unintended symbolisms of expression, if they are to be understood fully from the standpoint of behavior...there is no danger that the expressive character of language will be overlooked. It is too obvious a fact to call for much emphasis...that almost any word or phrase can be made to take on an infinite variety of meanings seems to indicate that in all language behavior there are intertwined in enormously complex patterns, isolable patterns of two distinct orders. These may be roughly defined as patterns of reference and patterns of expression.[13]

The team proposed that development in "expressive language" must come before development in participant and spectator language. Expressive language was seen to be the personal every day undifferentiated

[13] Sapir, Edward. Culture, Language and Personality. Berkeley, California, University of California Press, 1961. pp. 1-10.

language in which we exchange opinions, attitudes, beliefs and immediate pre-occupations. Thus, what is said reveals as much about the personality and state of mind of the speaker as it does of the event spoken about. It is defined as "language close to the speaker" and because it is free to follow the contours of thought and the shifting focus of attention, it is comparatively inexplicit--fully comprehensible only to those who know the speaker. Expressive language was also proposed as the mode in which:

> We are likely to rehearse the growing points of our formulation in the analysis of experience. Thus, we may suppose that all of the important products and projects that have affected human society are likely to have been given their first draft in talk between the originator and someone who was sufficiently in the picture to hear and consider utterances not yet ready for a wider hearing.[14]

In the Project Team's theory of the connections between language and learning, the expressive mode was found to be one of central importance. It was proposed as essentially the way in which an individual thinks when he or she is by himself or herself, therefore the form in which he is likely to try out ideas and hypotheses. It was also seen to be essential to the developmental idea that uniquely personal or intimate aspects of language use are in the expressive mode and were seen to be preconditions to language development in the other modes.

> The intimate context for the child may be necessarily the matrix of his language development. It might not be merely empirically difficult, but in point of fact logically too, to envisage any other starting point.[15]

The expressive mode then, is not merely a desirable use of language in education, it is essential. The notion of an expressive mode unites the

[14]Britton, James, Language and Education, The Open University. Milton Keynes, 1972, p. 24.

[15]The Development of Writing Abilities, p. 140.

theories of language description and language development and stands as a critical stage in developing in both directions simultaneously outward through the modes of participant language and spectator language.

More work was necessary to develop the model. The map of language functions from expressive to participant and from expressive to spectator was not yet adequate as a developmental or descriptive hypothesis of language functions. It was necessary to chart the growth of functions of language through these stages as being on a continuum of development. The categories or functions which were differentiated by the Project Team between "expressive" language and "participant" language and between "expressive" and "spectator" language were held to reflect the individual's mental processes and "follow closely the dynamics of cognitive and affective development," they could not be merely descriptive; they had--to reflect the stages of human growth a la Bruner and Piaget. There is not sufficient time or space here to describe these functions but I will offer a few observations about them. There was difficulty in analyzing the spectator role. The earlier characterizations by E.W. Harding and then by James Britton as including real, imaginary, and literary spectator-language, had already given it a developmental division. It clearly contained already more than was designated by the term "personal"; but what had come to be called "creative" uses of language clearly had their place here too. There was no such difficulty with the "participant" role. It remained uncharacterized other than as "language for getting things done in the world" and could be taken as a synonym for "impersonal." It was not possible to place the category of expressive

language between spectator mode and participant mode. But it was necessary in working out the model to show that an individual's language uses developed from the undifferentiated "expressive" mode along a continuum towards either participant or spectator language and through several stages of development within each.

Sapir had proposed that the component parts of speech--of reference of expression--vary according to demands of the communicative situation. He proposed that when the need to communicate increases, speech becomes more explicit at the expense of its expressive features. The team picked up on this idea and since it appeared to show movement from the expressive mode in the opposite direction toward the literary spectatorship of Harding which they designated as the "poetic mode." At the extreme of this mode, developmentally speaking "expressive features are modified so that the utterance becomes a verbal construct--a work of literary art such as a novel, poem, or drama."[16]

The research unit worked out a "dynamic" three term scale from expressive language working outward through three stages in each direction toward one pole a participant mode and toward another pole the spectator mode. It remained for them, however, to relate the functions of language in these modes to writing. They proposed the task as follows:

> Our task was to create a model which will enable us to characterize all mature written utterances, and then to go on to trace the developmental steps that lead to them.[17]

The team found the link between speech and writing once again in the work of Sapir:

16 The Development of Writing Abilities, p. 37.

17 The Development of Writing Abilities, p. 6.

> In Sapir's notion of "expressive," being modified according to the demands of "situations," we have found a most important link between speech and writing. The writing of young children is often very much like written down speech, and some writings by mature writers also have expressive features that make them seem nearer to speech and writing will vary a great deal, partly according to the demands of the situation...and partly according to social conventions and the level of sophistication or personal taste of the writer. Expressive language interested us particularly, both because it represented some overlap between speech and writing, and because, looked at developmentally, it seemed to be the mode in which young children chiefly write. Its relationship to thinking, moreover, seems particularly direct and this suggests its important as a mode of learning at any stage. It appears to be the means by which the new is tentatively explored, thoughts are half-uttered, attitudes half-expressed, the rest being left to be picked up by the listener, or reader, who is willing to take the unexpressed on trust. Its use is not, of course, always exploratory, but exploratory situations seem to call for it. Thus, a study of the expressive elements in writing has been a continuing thread in our work.[18]

The link between reading and writing was established in the model. But the nature of the writing process was a concern because of the solitariness in the absence of its addressee. The project team speculated about the ways in which the writer regards the reader and how this affects the process of production. They noted that George Herbert Mead had suggested in his book, Mind, Self and Society, that the internalizing of an audience was an essential part of all thinking. Man begins by "internalizing" individuals and finally internalizes a "generalized other" who represents society. This became the writer's sense of audience and, it was hypothesized, would profoundly affect the way a writer sees his or her task. The viewpoint of the writer became the significant controlling function in the relationship between the reader and the writer. It was

[18] The Development of Writing Abilities, p. 11.

possible that these "ways of seeing" could be categorized as evidence of a mental process taken directly from a piece of writing. Written texts could now be assigned on the basis of two different categorizations of discourse, one of function and one of the writer's sense of audience. Since both were seen to be developmental, they could be correllated and their effects as variables in the writing situation estimated.

The final phase of development was to refine the models of "function" and "audience" so that pieces of writing could be analyzed using these models as basis for analysis. The importance given the idea of the expressive function cannot be underestimated in the work of the Project Team. In order to develop the functions they drew on the hierarchy of functions set out by the linguist Roman Jacobson to determine that expressive speech could be described as an utterance that "stays close to the speaker," and is fully comprehensible only to the one who knows the speaker and shares this context. It is a verbalization of the speaker's immediate preoccupations and his mood at the moment. It is an utterance that is most relaxed and intimate, as free as possible from outside demands, whether those of a task or of an audience. It is, at this central point, easy to move from the participant role into the spectator role and vice-versa; mutual exploration, the pursuit of "togetherness," may precede equally by the pleasurable reconstruction of past experiences. But it is certainly not the case that every child's first attempts at writing are expressive according to the definition of the term.

> It must be true that until a child does write expressively he is failing to feed into the writing process the fullness of his linguistic resources--the knowledge of words and structures he has built up in speech--and that it will take him longer to arrive at the point where writing can serve a

> range of his purposes as broad and diverse as the purpose for which he uses speech...this, and all events, provided us with the major hypothesis regarding the development of writing ability in school: that what children write in the early stages should be a form of written down expressive speech, and what they read should also be, generally speaking, expressive. As their writing and reading progress side by side, they will move from the starting point to the three broadly differentiated kinds of writing toward the participant (the language of the spectator role) or toward the poetic (the language of the spectator role) and should also develop their own expressive speech in continuing ways.[19]

Testing the Model

In attempting to categorize "the expectation of a writer as a response to the expectations of his reader," or to develop the writer's "sense of audience" the Project Team found little in existing work of very much help to them. Martin Joos in, The Five Clocks distinguished five types of situations which effect the speaker's language and the hearer's response. This scale (intimate--casual--conversational--formal--frozen) did not however, discriminate finely enough between readers or between writers to be of use to the project. The team was looking for a model which would cast light on the development of the child's sense of audience from "speech for himself" through intermediate categories to an unknown public, which achievement would reflect his maturing sense of George Herbert Mead's "generalized other." Ultimately, the team decided to differentiate between the different roles of the teacher both towards the individual pupil and the whole class since it is for the most part the teacher who both defines the task, initiates it, and evaluates the results.

There are five categories in the model for "audience", of which the last two categories include two subdivisions for scripts that are

[19]The Development of Writing Abilities, p. 72.

difficult to classify, either because they seemed to have been written for no discernible audience at all, or because they have been directed to a named or "virtually named" person other than the teacher. The first category--"self" is "writing from one's own point-of-view without considering the irtelligibility to others of that point-of-view" a written version of "inner-speech". This class of writings has no subdivisions. The second, "teacher" includes, the largest number of subdivisions since it is with school writing that the project is concerned. These are "child to trusted adult" (where the pupil relies on the understanding of the teacher--as an extension of the parent) in a personal relationship; "pupil to teacher-general, a teacher--learner--dialogue, where the child relates to the teacher as a teacher and attempts to meet his idea of what the teacher expects of him in this particular task; "pupil to teacher," a particular relationship based upon a shared interest in the context, and "pupil to examiner" where the teacher's testing role is uppermost in the writer's mind. The third category shows the writer beginning to go beyond the confines of the teacher audience to "wider audience known" with three subdivisions. In the first, "expert to known layman" the writer is directing his utterance to an audience which knows less about his topic than he does himself, but it is an audience which is known to him. The second, "child or adolescent to peer group" is self-explanatory and in the third, "group member to working group", he is likely to be writing as a part of the on-going activity of his class. In the fourth category, "unknown audience--writer to his readers or unknown public," the writer is attempting to go beyond the confines of school to reach the wider public outside, for a variety of reasons and with a

variety of means. The categorization does not necessarily imply success--the criteria for inclusion is the writer's intention. The two models of "function" and "audience" were the two dimensions of the writing as process, schematisized by the project team in order to classify children's writing samples and draw conclusions for curriculum practice.

From the 2,122 scripts which were selected from 500 boys and girls from 85 classes and 65 schools analyzed in over 20 curriculum subjects, the research unit was very disappointed to find that the results of categorizing by function showed only 5.5% of the sample, 109 scripts, to be in the expressive mode, and much of this was in English or religious studies. They were concerned that expressive writing is likely to be both the most accessible mode for young writers and the key to developing confidence and range in using written language. Its absence in the pieces of writing they examined gave serious cause for concern.

Recommendations From Research

The team proposed that language policies be developed by groups of different subject teachers within a school for implementation by the whole staff (a cause taken up by the Bullock Report as language across the curriculum). Such a policy has also been recommended in the previously mentioned book by Michael Marland. They also proposed that local authorities and professional associations lend their strength to these innovations by organizing conferences and courses which "cut across the curriculum boundaries", to look at the relationship of "writing and talking to thinking and learning". In essence, they proposed that:

> Writing, which is much closer to talk than most school writing is at present should be encouraged right through the child's years at school--across the whole curriculum. We believe that such writing would free the writer to think in writing and to learn through using written language in the same way that he already uses talk.[20]

[20] Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum, p. 61.

Further recommendations growing from the findings of the research unit propose that the functions established by the writing process are both independent of school subjects and applicable to all of them. Learning in science, for example, is facilitated by the use of "personal everyday language" which draws on "first hand experience" no less than history or English. This change in the view of what knowledge is--from its being seen as an objective body of facts to be handed on, to "experience which has to be re-created in the mind of every knower", means the learning environment has to be established which encourages the growth of this process. The demand for impersonal, unexpressive writing within a subject area can actively inhibit learning because it isolates what is to be learned from the vital learning--making links between what is already known and the new information. Programs in all subjects must "match the children's interests and intentions and their views about what is important."[21] The team felt that the emphasis on children programming their own learning will foster creativity not only in "traditionally more personal subjects like English but in the sciences and History."[22] They stress the role of imagination:

> We believe that the mental act of envisaging or imagining (which we do continuously in conversation about people, events and ideas) has in school work been largely restricted either to the exploration of personal fantasies in English lessons or to the lower streams...as a form of mental activity which is regarded as inferior to generalizing about the facts and to ordering them logically and precisely...we feel that imagination is the mental process which enables a person to make his own connection whether this happens to be in the

21 Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum, p. 68.

22 Ibid., p. 81.

> sciences or in the arts...unless we provide many opportunities all over the curriculum for children to use their imaginations more extensively, their knowledge will remain inert."[23]

The Project Team proposed that the opportunities for using imagination increased whenever the influence of English spreads to other subjects, usually by the way of the integrated curriculum. Then it becomes clear to teachers of other subjects that learning in their subjects can be brought within the orbit of imagination and creativity through personal construction and the interpretation of events using expressive language.

Implications for Curriculum Planning

Obviously, the implications for curriculum planning are that education will have to be seen as a co-operative learning situation in each subject area in which teaching--learning relationship is one of dialogue and of reciprocity. Talk will be important in each subject area. When the Project Team analyzed the data that they had collected they found that most writing in the sample fell into the "transactional function" and the "teacher as examiner" audience category. The proportions grew dramatically larger in the fifth year and in the seventh year expressive writing and a more personal audience category shrank in significance. The team concluded that the pressure of examinations therefore inhibited all other language functions. Whatever the subject or potentially different mode of experience, all writing in school or college seems to grow together towards one use of the writing process. The team recommended that other methods of evaluating language than those of direct measurement should be investigated, and also that achievements in all forms of language use should not be restrained by those performances that are measurable

[23] Ibid., pp. 86-87.

becoming a prescribed use of language in school. With respect to the role of teacher the team proposed a child-centered learning environment with the child at the center of and initiating his/her own learning. From this and their view of "expressive" talk and writing, it logically follows that the traditional role of the teacher has very little to offer. Teacher directed learning imposes a structure on the learner in the view of the Project Team. He or she must be let free to perceive his or her own structure from first hand experience, or the interaction of his or her own every day language with secondary experience. It follows therefore, that each teacher would be a partner in learning. The teacher also learns. There are implications here for the relationship of the child and teacher. The relationship between teacher and taught must be perceived by the child to be a dialogue where each has something to contribute and the child knows that himself or herself is interesting to the teacher as a person. And whenever possible, learning must take place in an environment in which the relationship with the teacher is one of trust.

The implications for English teachers are spelled out clearly. English teachers must not be content merely to evoke "personal" writing which is felt many can do already. They must encourage growth toward the "poetic" as another and educationally equally relevent kind of ordering worth fostering in schools. The content teacher, such as the science teacher, has a choice. Either he or she can teach a body of accepted knowledge or a process by which that knowledge is acquired. The team believes that the way science teachers see their subject is bound up with the ways in which they see language. If they see it as a body of knowledge then "transactional" information writing will be the appropriate method of expression in communication. But if it is seen as a process then

self-expression and exploratory talk in language become the appropriate language uses. Unfortunately, they conclude at that moment the former view predominates, but the team believes that the language across the curriculum policy in schools should effect a gradual acceptance of the importance of the role of expressive language in science as well as in the humanities. But the Project Team in, Writing and Learning Across The Curriculum 11/16, proposed that language policies for schools are not cure-alls and "they should be approached with caution" because by themselves they cannot be effective.

> One would need to take into account all of the interconnected changes that would have to occur in the school in order to develop a language policy for that school and if one did not do that, one would only be tinkering with surface features and may actually make learning through language opportunities worse than better.[24]

The point being made is that one would have to buy most of the theoretical and practical recommendations made in this project to make a package. One would need to accept the theory of language as well as the theory of learning. Despite the considerable interest in developing language policies across the curriculum among teacher educators and curriculum specialists, only a few schools and school districts seem to be testing the idea to the extent that a proper evaluation can be made.

[24]Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum, pg. 169.

REFERENCES

Barnes, Douglas. "Language in the Secondary Classroom," in Language the Learner and the School (revised edition) Penguin Books, London, 1971.

Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. The Social Construction of Reality, London, Penguin Books, 1966.

Britton, James. Language and Education, The Open University, Milton Keynes, 1972.

_____. Language and Learning, London, Penguin Books, 1970.

Britton, James; Burgess, Tony; Martin, Nancy; McLeod, Alex; and Rosen, Harold. The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18), London, MacMillan Company, 1975.

Gusdorf, Georges. Speaking (translated by P. Brokelman, Chicago, Northwestern University Press, 1965.

Harding, D.W. Scrutiny, 1937.

Martin, Nancy; D'Arcy, Pat; Newton, Bryan; and Parker, Robert. Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum, Ward Lock, London, 1977.

Rosen, Harold. The Problems of Impersonal Language, University of London, Institute of Education, 1965.

_____. "Towards a Language Policy Across the Curriculum," in Barnes, Douglas; Britton, James; and Rosen, Harold. In Language, the Learner and the School, London Penguin Books, 1969.

Sapir, Edward. Culture, Language and Personality, Berkeley, California, University of California Press, 1961.